

NOV. 21. 2007 5:30PM

NO. 5393 P. 1

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
NOV 21 2007

**LAW OFFICES  
STAAS & HALSEY LLP**

Telephone  
(202) 434-1500

1201 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005

Facsimile  
(202) 434-1501

**FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION**  
November 21, 2007

TO: USPTO

ATTN:

FAX NO.: 1-571-273-8300

TELEPHONE:

FROM: Paul Bobowiec (202) 454-1572

RE: Letter regarding Office Action filed by certificate of facsimile transmission

YOUR REFERENCE: 09/874,283

OUR DOCKET: 1359.1049

NO. OF PAGES (Including this Cover Sheet) 3

**PRIVILEGED & CONFIDENTIAL**

The information contained in this communication is confidential, may be attorney-client privileged, and is intended only for the use of the addressee(s). Unauthorized use, disclosure or copying is strictly prohibited. If there are any problems with this transmission, please contact us immediately.

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8(a)  
I, \_\_\_\_\_, certify that this correspondence is being deposited  
with the United States Postal Service as first class  
mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for  
Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria VA 22313-1450  
on \_\_\_\_\_, 2007.  
\_\_\_\_\_  
STAS & HALSEY

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
NOV 21 2007

RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR 1.116  
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE  
EXAMINING GROUP: 2194  
Docket No.: 1359.1049

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of:

Akira KUDO, et al.

Serial No. 09/874,283

Group Art Unit: 2194

Confirmation No. 6300

Filed: June 6, 2001

Examiner: Van H. Nguyen

For: COLLABORATION APPARATUS BETWEEN INFORMATION PROCESSING  
SYSTEMS, INTEGRATED INFORMATION PROCESSING SYSTEM, AND RECORDING  
MEDIUM STORING A COLLABORATION PROGRAM BETWEEN INFORMATION  
PROCESSING SYSTEMS

**LETTER TO EXAMINER AND REQUEST  
FOR WITHDRAWAL OF FINAL STATUS AS PREMATURE**

Commissioner for Patents  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

ATTN: BOX AF

Sir:

Applicants respectfully submit that the current Final Office Action mailed September 10, 2007 is incomplete since the Examiner has not responded to all of Applicants' arguments traversing the rejections from the previous Office Action mailed November 30, 2006 that were presented in the previous Amendment filed June 19, 2007 ("previous Amendment").

As set forth in MPEP §707.07(f) entitled Answer All Material Traversed:

an examiner must provide clear explanations of all actions taken by the examiner during prosecution of an application.

In the previous Amendment, Applicant traversed the rejection of pending claims 4, 6, 8, 10, 14, 16, and 20-22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Materna et al. (US 4,714,995).

Applicants argued, in part, even assuming *arguendo* a "SEND command" and a "distribution module may continue performing other functions" that are disclosed by Materna

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8(a)  
This communication is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on 11/21/2007.  
STAAS E. HALSEY 2007

Serial No. 09/874,283

respectively teach a "role object as an active role and a "role object as a passive role, as the Examiner asserts in support of the rejection, Materna does not disclose that such an *arguendo* "role object as an active role" is generated "with respect to information processing means that is a data transmission origin," as recited by claim 4, for example. Applicants also argued that Materna does not disclose the *arguendo* "role object as a passive role" is generated "with respect to information processing means that is a data transmission destination," as recited by claim 4, for example. The Examiner does not address these arguments.

Further, Applicants argued that Materna does not disclose a selection from a plurality of kinds of communication methods including real communication and delayed batch communication and batch communication. Applicants argued that rather, Materna just teaches a singular method. The Examiner does not address this argument.

As set forth in MPEP § 706.07(d):

(l)f, on request by applicant for reconsideration, the primary examiner finds the final rejection to have been premature, he or she should withdraw the finality of the rejection.

Accordingly, Applicantd respectfully request that the finality of the current Office Action be withdrawn and another action issued including a complete response and with the due date accordingly reset.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Letter, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: November 21, 2007

By: Paul W. Bobowiec  
Paul W. Bobowiec  
Registration No. 47,431

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.81(a)  
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on 11/21/07  
STAAS & HALSEY LLP 20 07